

May 23, 2000

R-19J

Henry Nickel
Counsel for the Detroit Edison Company
Hunton & Williams
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington D.C. 20006-1109

Dear Mr. Nickel:

I am responding to your request on behalf of the Detroit Edison Company for an applicability determination regarding the proposed replacement and reconfiguration of the high pressure section of two steam turbines at the company's Monroe Power Plant, referred to as the Dense Pack project. Specifically, you requested that the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) determine whether the Dense Pack project at the Monroe Power Plant would be considered a major modification that would subject the project to pollution control requirements under the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) program.

We have reviewed your original request, dated June 8, 1999, and the supplemental information you submitted on December 10, 1999, and March 16, 2000. We provisionally conclude that the Dense Pack project would not be a major modification. Thus, Detroit Edison may proceed with the project without first obtaining a PSD permit. Although the Dense Pack project would constitute a nonroutine physical change to the facility that might well result in a significant increase in air pollution, Detroit Edison asserts that emissions will not in fact increase due to the construction activity, and EPA has no information to dispute that assertion.

As you know, nonroutine changes of any type, purpose, or magnitude at an electric utility steam generating unit -- ranging from projects to increase production efficiency to even the complete replacement of entire major components -- are excluded from PSD coverage as long as they do not significantly increase emissions from the source. Thus, Detroit Edison has been free to proceed at any time with the Dense Pack project without first obtaining a PSD permit as long as it adheres to its stated intention to not increase emissions as a result of the project. Indeed, EPA encourages the company to proceed with the project on this basis, since it appears to both reduce emissions per unit of output and not increase actual air pollution.

As you are also aware, under the applicable new source review regulations, in determining if a physical change will result in a significant emissions increase at an electric utility plant, companies may use an "actual" to "representative actual annual emissions" test for emissions from the electric utility steam generating unit, under which a calculation of baseline emissions and a projection of future emissions after the change is needed. Our determination of nonapplicability is provisional because Detroit Edison has not, to our knowledge, provided a calculation of baseline emissions or projected future emissions to the permitting agency, and this should be done prior to the start of construction. The basis for this determination is summarized below and is set forth in full in the enclosed detailed analysis.

In determining whether an activity triggers PSD, the Clean Air Act and EPA's regulations specify a two-step test. The first step is to determine if such activity is a physical or operational change, and if it is, the second step is to determine whether emissions will increase because of the change. The statute admits of no exception from its sweeping scope, but EPA's regulations contain some narrow exceptions to the definition of physical or operational change. In particular, Detroit Edison claims that the Dense Pack project is eligible for the exclusion for routine maintenance, repair, and replacement. The determination of whether a proposed physical change is "routine" is a case-specific determination which takes into consideration the nature, extent, purpose, frequency, and cost of the work, as well as other relevant factors. After carefully reviewing all the information you submitted in light of the relevant factors, EPA has determined that the proposed project is not "routine."

The purpose of the Dense Pack project, to significantly enhance the present efficiency of the high pressure section of the steam turbine, signifies that the project is not routine. An upgrade of this nature is markedly different from the frequent, inexpensive, necessary, and incremental maintenance and replacement of deteriorated blades that is commonly practiced in the utility industry. For instance, past blade maintenance and replacement of only the deteriorated blades at Detroit Edison has never increased efficiency over the original design. Accordingly, because increasing turbine efficiency by a total redesign of a major component is a defining feature of the proposed Dense Pack project, it clearly goes significantly beyond both historic turbine work at Detroit Edison, and what would otherwise be considered a regular, customary, or standard undertaking for the purpose of maintaining the existing steam turbine units. The project also goes well beyond routine turbine

maintenance, repair, and replacement activities for the utility industry in general.

The nature and extent of the work in question -- replacement of the entire high pressure sections of the steam turbines for Units 1 and 4 at Monroe -- suggests that the Dense Pack project is not routine. It would result in greater efficiency above the level that can be reached by simply replacing deteriorated blades with ones of the same design and, in addition, will substantially increase efficiency over the original design. Specifically, the Dense Pack upgrade would not only restore the 7 percent of the efficiency rating lost over the years at each unit but would improve the unit's efficiency by an additional 5 percent over its original design capacity. Accordingly, the proposed project represents a significant and major redesign and replacement of the entire high pressure sections of the steam turbines at Units 1 and 4 at the Monroe facility.

The frequency with which utilities have undertaken turbine upgrades like the Dense Pack project also indicates the nonroutine nature of the changes. The information provided by Detroit Edison, regarding past history at the Monroe facility, describes what is characterized as necessary maintenance, repair, and replacement of deteriorated turbine blades approximately every 4 years. During these overhaul periods, it is not uncommon for the company to replace up to several turbine blades at one time. It is common among other utilities to also perform similar turbine maintenance. However, Detroit Edison has not provided any information to suggest that a complete replacement and redesign of the high pressure section of a steam turbine is conducted frequently at Monroe or at any other individual utility. Instead, Detroit Edison relies on its claim that projects "similar" to the Dense Pack project have been performed at a number of utilities. This information does not indicate that the replacement of the high pressure section of the steam turbine is frequent at the typical utility source; to the contrary, the only available information reflects that projects like the Dense Pack project have been performed only one time, if ever, at individual sources.

The cost of the Dense Pack project is significant and tends to indicate that this project is nonroutine. Detroit Edison expects the Dense Pack replacement to cost approximately \$6 million for each turbine unit, for a total of \$12 million. The EPA has rejected claims of routineness in past cases where the cost was substantially less than this figure. Moreover, Detroit Edison intends to capitalize the entire cost of this project, and EPA believes that a \$12 million project that is 100 percent capital improvement indicates that it is a major undertaking.

Beyond the clearly significant absolute cost of this project, available information suggests that this expenditure far exceeds the cost typically associated with turbine blade maintenance activity. Detroit Edison provided only a summary of the total project costs for past maintenance and inspections at the facility, the total costs of which ranged from less than \$1 million to a little more than \$6 million. Although Detroit Edison did not provide any detail regarding what specific activities comprise these aggregated amounts, it acknowledges that it spent only \$18,700, \$33,100, and \$7,900 to replace high-pressure rotors in three turbine projects in 1981 and 1982. Further, the project is significantly more costly than simply replacing deteriorated blades today; Detroit Edison acknowledges that the Dense Pack upgrade would cost three times more than its alternative blade repair and replacement project. Accordingly, it appears that the costs associated with the Dense Pack project greatly exceed the amounts spent previously by Detroit Edison or that it would spend presently for the replacement of deteriorated turbine blades or rotors.

For the reasons delineated above, we conclude that the changes proposed by Detroit Edison are not routine. Detroit Edison's submissions do not demonstrate that projects such as the Dense Pack project are frequent, inexpensive, or done for the purpose of maintaining the facility in its present condition. Instead, the source relies on two principal arguments: (1) it claims that this project is less significant in scope than was the activity in question in the 1988 applicability determination for the Wisconsin Electric Power Company (WEPCO); and (2) it alleges that EPA has interpreted the exclusion for routine activity expansively to exempt all projects that do not increase a unit's emission rate. EPA rejects both of these arguments, the former because both EPA and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit viewed WEPCO's activity as "far from" routine and thus this attempted comparison to WEPCO is unsuitable, and the latter because it is demonstrably incorrect. The attached analysis addresses these points in significant detail.

When nonroutine physical or operational changes significantly increase emissions to the atmosphere, they are properly characterized as major modifications and are subject to the PSD program. In general, a physical change in the nature of the Dense Pack project, which provides for the more economical production of electricity, would be expected to result in the increased utilization of the affected units, and thus, increased emissions. Notwithstanding the fact the Monroe units may be high on the dispatch order, the Dense Pack project would allow Detroit Edison to produce electricity more cheaply per unit of output, thereby creating an incentive to run Units 1 and 4 above current

levels. Even a small increase over current normal levels in the utilization of the affected units would result in a significant increase in actual emissions of criteria pollutants. For example, in 1997, at the Monroe facility Unit 1 emitted approximately 14,000 tons of nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and 41,000 tons of sulfur dioxide (SO_2), and Unit 2 emitted 12,000 tons of NO_x and 35,000 tons of SO_2 . Based on this information, if a one to five percent increase in operation were to result from the Dense Pack project, increases on the order of 160-800 tons of NO_x and 400-2000 tons of SO_2 would occur.

Detroit Edison, however, maintains that emissions will not increase as a result of the Dense Pack project. Specifically, the company contends that representative actual annual emissions following the change will not be greater than its pre-change actual emissions, because the Dense Pack upgrade will not result in increased utilization of the units. As you are aware, the PSD regulations (under the provisions commonly known as the "WEPCO rule") allow a source undertaking a nonroutine change that could affect emissions at an electric utility steam generating unit to lawfully avoid the major source permitting process by using the unit's representative actual annual emissions to calculate emissions following the change if the source submits information for 5 years following the change to confirm its pre-change projection. In projecting post-change emissions, Detroit Edison does not have to include that portion of the unit's emissions which could have been accommodated before the change and is unrelated to the change, such as demand growth.

Under the WEPCO rule, Detroit Edison must compute baseline actual emissions and must project the future actual emissions from the modified unit for the 2-year period after the physical change (or another 2-year period that is more representative of normal operation in the unit's modified state). As noted above, Detroit Edison has not provided these figures to verify its projection of no increase in actual emissions, and should submit them to the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality prior to beginning construction. In addition, Detroit Edison must maintain and submit to the permitting agency on an annual basis for a period of at least 5 years (or a longer period not to exceed 10 years, if such a period is more representative of the modified unit's normal post-change operations) from the date the units at the Monroe Plant resume regular operation, information demonstrating that the renovation did not result in a significant emissions increase. If Detroit Edison fails to comply with the reporting requirements of the WEPCO rule or if the submitted information indicates that emissions have increased as a consequence of the change, it will be required to obtain a PSD permit for the Dense Pack project.

Finally, regardless of whether PSD review is triggered due to the Dense Pack project, Detroit Edison must meet all other applicable federal, state, and local air pollution requirements.

This determination will be final in 30 days unless, during that time, Detroit Edison seeks to confer with or appeal to the Administrator or her designee regarding it. If you have any questions regarding this determination, please contact Laura Hartman, Environmental Engineer, at (312) 353-5703, or Jane Woolums, Associate Regional Counsel, at (312) 886-6720.

Sincerely,

/s/

Francis X. Lyons
Regional Administrator

Enclosure

cc: Peter Marquardt, Esq., Special Counsel
Detroit Edison Company
2000 Second Avenue - 688 WCB
Detroit, Michigan 48336

Russell Harding, Director
Michigan Department of Environmental Quality